





FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. 09/489,514 01/21/2000 S. R. Narayanan 06618-406001 5937 20985 7590 10/01/2002 FISH & RICHARDSON, PC **EXAMINER** 4350 LA JOLLA VILLAGE DRIVE MERCADO, JULIAN A SUITE 500 SAN DIEGO, CA 92122 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 1745 13 DATE MAILED: 10/01/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

		∵	
			AS-13
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/489,514	NARAYANAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
•	Julian A. Mercado	1745	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence addre	ess
THE REPLY FILED 09 September 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.			
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]			
 a)			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:			
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);			
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);			
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or			
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).			
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached.			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.			
7.⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 7-20.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)			
10. Other:			

Application/Control Number: 09/489,514

Art Unit: 1745

ADVISORY ACTION

This Advisory Action is responsive to Applicant's response filed September 9, 2002.

Applicant's response will be entered upon timely filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief. Applicant's arguments therein have been fully considered, however they are not persuasive.

Applicant submits that the Zonyl reference describes a different function for the fluoropolymer particles as compared with the Serpico reference. This is not persuasive, however, in view of both references employing fluoropolymer particles as a coating additive within an aqueous dispersion. Additionally, it is asserted that the Zonyl reference was relied upon as a basis for obviousness in employing a smaller particle size for the fluoropolymer particles already disclosed within Serpico's invention for reasons such as increased dispersion stability and decreased surface tension.

Arguments against the Zonyl particles in Applicant's invention not performing the role of a binder (unlike in Serpico wherein the fluoropolymer particles are alleged to melt-flow and coat the catalyst particles) are not persuasive, as limitations precluding such melt-flow and coating of the catalyst particles are outside the scope of the present claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Julian A. Mercado whose telephone number is (703) 305-0511. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

Application/Control Number: 09/489,514

Art Unit: 1745

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick J. Ryan, can be reached on (703) 308-2383. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3599 for regular communications and (703) 305-3599 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

September 27, 2002

Patrick Byen
Supervison: Pater Framiner
Technology